

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application No.: 10/726,612

Attorney Docket No.: Q78605

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Submitted herewith please find one replacement drawing sheet in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.84. The Examiner is respectfully requested to acknowledge receipt of these drawings. The submitted drawings are intended to replace the drawings previously submitted on December 4, 2003.

Attachment: One Replacement Drawing Sheet.

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1-5 stand rejected.

Claims 1, 2, 4, and 5 are hereby amended. Claims 6-14 are newly added.

Specification and Drawings

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner appears to have misinterpreted the term “composition rates” to mean “changes of images” in the instant Office Action. (See Office Action at 2.) However, the term “composition rate” has been used in the specification to refer to a ratio used to compose multiple sets of image data to create a composite image. For example, the original specification, describing an exemplary embodiment, reads in part:

[T]he display control section 34 can generate composite (blended) image data of the first pattern image data and the second pattern image data blended according to a positional relationship between the first model and the second model, and image composition rate setting, and display this composite image.

(Specification at 13.) Furthermore, this is clarified as follows:

[A] result of adding a pixel value P_0 . . . [to a] pixel value P_1 having composition rate set times image composition rate σ_1 , that is a value of $P_0 + P_1 \times \sigma_1$, is set as a new pixel value.

(Specification at 12, emphasis added.)

Thus, the original specification clearly shows that the most reasonable meaning of “composition rate” in the disclosed exemplary embodiments is a ratio by which first and second image data are composed to create a composite image. The above passage makes this clear by describing an exemplary embodiment in which the “pixel value P_1 ” is

multiplied by a “composition rate σ_1 ,” which determines the extent to which the pixel value P1 contributes to the “new pixel value.”

In light of the illustrative portions of the original specification above, and in the interest of clarification, Applicant therefore amends the specification, claims, and drawings to replace the word “rate” with the word “ratio” throughout. As explained above, although the term “rate” was intended, and may be construed, to indicate a ratio in the instant application, use of the term “ratio” is more common in this context, is fully supported by the present disclosure, and will likely help to clarify the intent of the present disclosure.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

A. U.S. Patent No. 5,616,079 to Iwase et al.

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,616,079 to Iwase et al. (“Iwase”). Applicant traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Regarding the Iwase reference, Iwase appears to show an “image rendering unit that arranges models or polygons of image data stored as texture information, for purposes of texture mapping within a three dimensional space,” as alleged by the Examiner; however, the cited portions of Iwase fail to disclose “generating a composite image composed of a plurality of image data based on the image composition ratios, and displaying the composite image on the surface of a substantially planar game field,” as required by amended claim 1. In other words, the cited portions of Iwase only disclose the

rendering of a whole scene, whereas claim 1 requires composing image data, based on image composition ratios, to produce a composite image.

Because Iwase, thus, fails to anticipate amended claim 1, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this rejection of independent claim 1 and its dependent claims 2 and 3. Moreover, because claims 4 and 5 recite features analogous to those of claim 1, Applicant submits that claims 4 and 5 are also patentable over Iwase at least for reasons analogous to those presented above.

B. U.S. Patent No. 6,280,323 to Yamazaki et al.

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,280,323 to Yamazaki et al. (“Yamazaki”). Applicant traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Although Yamazaki appears to show processing of texture data to be mapped to polygons, and processing of color and luminance data of the textures, Yamazaki does not appear to disclose anywhere that such a texture is a “composite image” which is “composed of a plurality of image data based on . . . image composition ratios,” as required by amended claim 1.

Thus, Yamazaki also fails to anticipate amended claim 1. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this rejection of independent claim 1 and its dependent claims 2 and 3. Moreover, because claims 4 and 5 recite features analogous to those

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application No.: 10/726,612

Attorney Docket No.: Q78605

of claim 1, Applicant submits that claims 4 and 5 are also patentable over Yamazaki at least for reasons analogous to those presented above.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Alan J. Kasper
Registration No. 25,426

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 13, 2007